

REMARKS

I. Amendments

The original claims 1-10 have been cancelled from the specification and replaced with new claims 11-26.

New independent claim 11 incorporates many of the limitations found in the original claims 1-3. Support for the limitations of new independent claim 11 is found throughout the specification such as, for example, at page 3, lines 22-25; page 4, lines 15-29; and page 5, lines 12-15.

The limitations of claims 6, 8, 9, and 10 are found, respectively, in new dependent claims 12 (17 and 22), 13 (18 and 23), 14 (19 and 24), and 15 (20 and 25).

The limitations of claims 16 and 26 that require the replacement of the sliding gate of the sliding gate valve to be replaced with a particulate trap are found in the specification at page 4, lines 1-3.

The limitations of claim 21, providing for a cleaning step, are found in the specification at page 5, lines 19-28.

II. § 103 Rejection

The rejection of claims 1-5 as being obvious over the Wright patent U.S. 5,547,495 is rendered moot by the cancellation of the claims and replacement thereof with new claims 11-26.

New independent claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the Wright patent in that the equipment configuration of Applicant's claimed process is different from the configuration taught by the Wright patent. The Wright patent teaches an assembly that can include a catalytic converter placed upstream of an electrostatic precipitator. The electrostatic precipitator is used to remove particulate matter contained in the flue gas stream.

Applicant's claimed invention, on the other hand, includes a particulate trap that is placed in a conduit upstream from a bed of environmental catalyst. The particle trap provides for the removal of particulate matter from a combustion gas stream prior to contacting it with the environmental catalyst. This is to prevent plugging of the catalyst particles. The purpose or function, or both, of Applicant's invention is, thus, different from that of the Wright patent.

In view of the differences between Applicant's claimed invention and the teachings of the Wright patent it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 11 and dependent claims 12-26 are patentable over the cited prior art.

III. § 102 Rejection

The rejection of claims 6-10 as being anticipated by the Peter et al patent, U.S. 6,063,150 is rendered moot by the cancellation of the claims.

The limitations of claims 6 – 10 have been incorporated in various of the dependent claims 12 – 26, which depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 11. Independent claim 11 incorporates the limitations of cancelled claims 1- 3, which were not subject to the Examiner's § 102 rejection.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and discussion, Applicant respectfully asserts that pending claims 11-26 are patentable, and early allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN P. GILES, ALEX F. WOLDHUIS,
MARINUS M. W. J. MIGGELBRINK,
JAMES A. SALTER, and CHARLES P. BRUNDRETT

P. O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463

By 
Their Attorney, Charles W. Stewart
Registration No. 34,023
(713) 241-0360